



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/050,238      | 01/16/2002  | Michael Paul Aronson | J6699/1(C)          | 6809             |

201 7590 01/28/2008  
UNILEVER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
700 SYLVAN AVENUE,  
BLDG C2 SOUTH  
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1617

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

01/28/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

C

|                              |                                      |                                       |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/050,238 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>ARONSON ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Shobha Kantamneni | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1617               |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 9-13, 15-17 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) NONE is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/25/2007 has been entered.

The Amendment received on 10/25/2007, wherein claim 5 has been amended.

Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 4-7, 9-13, 15-17, and 19-23 are pending, and examined herein.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn, Jr et al. (WO 9625144, equivalent to US 6,080,708), in view of Tsaur (US 6,395,690, PTO-892) .

Glenn, Jr et al. teaches the process for making a cleansing/moisturizing dual composition (a wet-skin treatment composition) which is an oil-in-water emulsion, wherein (a) an aqueous phase comprising water and dispersion stabilizer such as trihydroxystearin having the formula (i) (according to the formula therein, the molecular weight is deemed lower than 1000 Daltones and capable of forming a network in the aqueous phase), which is a fatty acid ester or C14-C22 acyl derivative as the instantly claimed, or silicas (see US 6,080,708, abstract; col.4, line 46 to col.6) or polymeric stabilizers herein; (b) a structured oil phase (a lipid phase) comprising triglycerides and a structurant in about 75% by wt of that forms a stable 3-dimentional network comprising solid fatty esters, fatty alcohols, wax, petrolatum, with lipid droplet size 0.1-100 microns within the emulsion, having viscosity within the instant claimed (see col.10-16). Glenn et al. also teaches that the aqueous phase of oil-in-water emulsion comprises from about 1 part to about 30 parts of surfactant selected from the group consisting of anionic surfactants, nonionic surfactants, cationic surfactants, amphoteric surfactants, and mixtures thereof. The emulsions containing 0.5 parts to 8 parts C8-C14 soap i.e anionic surfactant wherein the soap has a counterion selected from K and N(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>OH)<sub>3</sub>, in addition to synthetic surfactant such as amphoteric, nonionic, and cationic are taught as preferred embodiments. See abstract; column 6, lines 3-60; column 7, lines 44-49; column 24, claim 20-24. It is also disclosed, that the preferred size of lipid droplets within the emulsion ranges from 0.1-100 microns. See column 13, lines 59-60. An oil-in-water composition comprising structurants, myristic alcohol,

petrolatum; oil such as liquid hydrogenated polyisobutene, liquid cottonseed; organic dispersion stabilizer, trihydroxystearin is disclosed. See column 18, Examples 1-4.

Glenn, Jr et al. also clearly teaches the stepwise process for making the composition therein (see col 17, lines 25-65), including measuring skin retention and emulsions tests at 35 °C (see col.16, line 40-col.17, line 23). The reference also teaches that antimicrobial agents (preservative) and EDTA (chelating agent) and an essential oil are used. See col. 9, line 49 - col.10, line 37; col. 17, lines 42-45. See instant claims 37-38.

Glenn, Jr et al. does not expressly disclose the step of passing structured oil-in-water predispersion through a screen having an opening of up to about 2000 micrometers as claimed herein.

Tsuar teaches a process for making aqueous liquid cleanser compositions containing large oil droplets by passing the cleanser through a screen or screens having specific size of openings. It is taught that the size of oil droplets in the composition therein can be easily controlled by the number of screens and the size of the opening on the screen. An in-line screen process for making compositions containing oil droplets with the size in the range of 20 to 5000 micrometers, and preferably 100 to 400 microns is taught. See abstract; column 2, lines 40-50; column 11, lines 2-3. Tsuar also teaches that a low shear mixing in-line screen process is a preferred process to make oil/polymer blend (oil-in-water emulsion, wherein aqueous phase consists of xantham gum, a carbohydrate gum) with uniform controllable droplet size. See column 11, lines 4-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pass oil-in-water predispersion through a screen having an opening of up to about 2000 micrometers to make the wet skin treatment composition because Tsuar teaches that cleansing compositions containing oil droplets of specific droplet size are obtained by passing the predispersion through screen or screens having screens opening of different sizes.

One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to employ a process wherein the oil-in-water predispersion of Glenn et al. is passed through a screen having an opening of up to about 2000 micrometers with reasonable expectation of obtaining a wet skin treatment oil-in-water composition with lipid droplet size in the range taught by Glenn et al., i.e 0.1-100 microns, and with the expectation of having better control of droplet size in the emulsion.

Furthermore, the combined teachings of Glenn et al., and Tsuar renders the claimed composition obvious, the property of such a claimed composition will also be rendered obvious by the prior art teachings, since the properties, namely foam volume of less than 5 cc, are inseparable from its composition. Note that the emulsions taught by Glenn et al. contain preferably 0.5 parts to 8 parts C8-C14 soap i.e anionic surfactant wherein the soap has a counterion selected from K and N(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>OH)<sub>3</sub> i.e less than 1 % anionic surfactant as in instant claim 22. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the composition or renders the composition obvious, then the properties are also taught or rendered obvious by the prior art. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990.) See MPEP 2112.01. The burden is shifted to Applicant to show that

the prior art product does not possess or render obvious the same properties as the instantly claimed product.

***Response to Applicant's Arguments:***

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but not found persuasive.

Applicant argues that "The process used to make the large oil drop compositions of Tsaur and the compositions of Glenn are completely different and reflect the difference in what they are attempting to achieve." These arguments have been considered, but not found persuasive. It is pointed out that Glenn et al. teaches that the size of the lipid droplets within the emulsion ranges from 0.1 microns to 100 microns, and further teaches that the size is an important factor for lipid deposition on the skin. Tsuar teaches a process for making aqueous liquid cleanser compositions containing oil droplets 100 to 400 microns in size by passing the cleanser through a screen or screens having specific size of openings. Glenn and Tsuar teach a process of making similar compositions with overlapping droplet size of oil in water compositions. Tsuar further teaches the advantage of using in line screen process, such as better control of droplet size. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made would have been motivated to employ a process wherein the oil-in-water predispersion of Glenn et al. can be passed through a screen having an opening of up to about 2000 micrometers with reasonable expectation of having better control on the droplet size in the emulsion.

Applicant argues that "In short, the disclosure of a means to reduce droplet size (regardless of what initial and final size are) is a teaching away or disincentive from

applying the Tsaur reference to process of Glenn where, if anything, you want to maintain the droplets as large as reasonably possible after mixing lipid blend into aqueous phase." These arguments have been considered, but not found persuasive because Glenn teaches that the droplet size is an important factor for lipid deposition on the skin for skin cleansing oil-in-water composition. Tsuar teaches various processes for achieving liquid cleansers with required droplet size, and teaches the advantage of using in line screen process, such as better control of droplet size. Accordingly, there is clear motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to employ a process wherein the oil-in-water predispersion of Glenn et al. can be passed through a screen having an opening of up to about 2000 micrometers with reasonable expectation of having better control on the droplet size in the emulsion.

Applicant's remarks with respect to the Declaration of Michael P. Aronson mailed on February 1, 2005 have been considered, but not found persuasive. It is pointed out that a single particular composition is employed in the compared testing therein. Thus, the evidence in the testing therein is not commensurate in scope with Glenn's patent and the claimed invention and does not demonstrate criticality of claimed range of the ingredients in the prior art and the claimed composition.

Claims 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn, Jr et al. (WO 9625144, equivalent to US 6,080,708), in view of Tsaur as applied to claims 4-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20, 22-23 above, and further in view of Lochhead et al. (US 5,004,598, PTO-1449).



Glenn, Jr et al. as discussed above teaches the process for making a cleansing/moisturizing dual composition (a wet-skin treatment composition) which is an oil-in-water emulsion, wherein (a) an aqueous phase comprising water and dispersion stabilizer such as trihydroxystearin, or silicas or polymeric stabilizers herein; (b) a structured oil phase (a lipid phase) comprising triglycerides and a structurant in about 75% by wt of that forms a stable 3-dimentional network comprising solid fatty esters , fatty alcohols, wax, petrolatum, with droplet size 0.1-100 microns, having viscosity within the instant claimed. Glenn et al. also teaches that the aqueous phase of oil-in-water emulsion comprises from about 1 part to about 30 parts of surfactant selected from the group consisting of anionic surfactants, nonionic surfactants, cationic surfactants, amphoteric surfactants, and mixtures thereof.

Glenn et al. does not teach the process for making a cleansing/moisturizing composition without a surfactant.

Lochhead et al. teach a process for making cleansing/moisturizing oil-in-water emulsions without a surfactant, having a droplet size of 10 to 100 microns, comprising an (a) aqueous phase comprising water and a polymeric dispersion stabilizer, copolymer of acrylic acid, long chain acrylate; (b) oil phase comprises triglycerides, structurant such as petrolatum, fatty alcohol. See claims 1, 5, column 14-15; column 12, EXAMPLE column 3, lines 48-55; column 9, lines 30-33. It is also disclosed that the polymeric stabilizer can function as primary emulsifier or surfactant, and thus the composition can be made without conventional surfactants. See column 9, lines 34-37. It is further taught that these compositions made devoid of surfactant will have greater

adhesion of the barrier oil to skin, and protection against skin irritants. See column 3, lines 13-18; column 4, lines 36-41.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to prepare a wet-skin treatment composition without a conventional surfactant.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to prepare a skin-treatment composition as taught by Glenn without a surfactant because Lochhead teaches the process of making similar oil-in-water cosmetic composition without a conventional surfactant.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to prepare a skin-treatment composition without any conventional surfactants with the expectation of obtaining a cosmetic composition which will have greater adhesion of the barrier oil to skin, and greater protection against skin irritants.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shobha Kantamneni whose telephone number is 571-272-2930. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday, 8.00 am-3.00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, Ph.D can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax


Application/Control Number:  
10/050,238  
Art Unit: 1617

Page 10

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is  
571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shobha Kantamneni, Ph.D  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit : 1617



SHEENIPARMANASHIAN  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER